United Nations A/HRC/33/34

General Assembly

Distr.: General
15 July 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-third session
Agenda items 2 and 8
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles)*

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/18 and contains information on activities carried out from October 2014 to May 2016 by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (the former International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights) in considering and reviewing applications for accreditation and reaccreditation of national human rights institutions.

* The annex to the present report is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.16-12213(E)

1612213

Please recycle

Contents

		Pages
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Accreditation process of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	4
III.	Accreditation during the period under review	6
	A. Second session in 2014	6
	B. First session in 2015	6
	C. Second session in 2015	7
	D. First session in 2016	7
IV.	Conclusions and recommendations	7
Annex		
	Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	9

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/18, in which the Secretary-General was requested to report to the Human Rights Council at its thirty-third session on the activities of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (the former International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights) in accrediting national institutions in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles).

2. The present report includes activities and achievements since the issuance of the 2014 report of the Secretary-General on the accreditation of national human rights institutions (A/HRC/27/40).

3. The Statute of the Global Alliance (hereinafter the Statute) mandates the Subcommittee on Accreditation to review and analyse the applications for accreditation that have been submitted by national human rights institutions and to make recommendations to the Bureau of the Global Alliance (hereinafter the Bureau) on the compliance of institutions with the Paris Principles. In accordance with the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, the classifications for accreditation are:

- "A" status: Fully compliant with the Paris Principles
- "B" status: Not fully compliant with the Paris Principles

4. For the purpose of ensuring a fair balance of regional representation, article 2.1 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation requires that the Subcommittee be composed of one national human rights institution accredited "A" status from each of the Global Alliance's four regional groups, namely Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe, appointed by the regional groups for a renewable term of three years. The members of the Subcommittee designate the Chair by consensus from among themselves, for a renewable term of one year.

5. During the period under review, the members of the Subcommittee were from the national human rights institutions of Canada, France, Mauritania, the State of Palestine and Jordan. The chairmanship was assumed by the national human rights institution of Canada. The national human rights institution of the State of Palestine resigned and was replaced by the national human rights institution of Jordan for the May 2016 session.

6. Pursuant to article 6 of the Statute, which requires that the general and Bureau meetings of the Global Alliance as well as the meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation be held under the auspices of and in cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the latter assumes the secretariat functions. In addition to the analysis and preparation of accreditation files, this entails the presence of OHCHR in all meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, including during the deliberations and the adoption of reports.

1 See para. 29.

II. Accreditation process of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

7. Human Rights Council resolution 16/21 and General Assembly resolution 65/281 on reviewing the work and functioning of the Human Rights Council provide more visibility to "A" status human rights institutions fully compliant with the Paris Principles. Consequently, under the universal periodic review process, these institutions have been granted a separate section for the summary of their contribution in the stakeholders' report. They are entitled to intervene immediately after the State under review during the adoption of the outcome of the review by the Human Rights Council plenary. "A" status institutions are also entitled to intervene immediately after the State concerned during the interactive dialogue, following the presentation of a country mission report by a special procedure mandate holder. Furthermore, they may nominate candidates for special procedure mandates.

8. The General Assembly, in its resolution 70/163, encourages all relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes, in accordance with their respective mandates, to allow for the contribution of national human rights institutions compliant with the Paris Principles to such mechanisms and processes, bearing in mind their engagement with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms.

9. The enhanced participatory rights of "A" status national human rights institutions in the Human Rights Council and their goal of achieving similar rights in other United Nations mechanisms and processes implies increased responsibility of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, which is mandated to assess the compliance of national human rights institutions with the Paris Principles.

10. The Global Alliance has introduced various measures to improve its accreditation procedures:

(a) The review of national human rights institutions, which was aimed at assessing their effectiveness and performance, has become more rigorous, as it is now based on documented evidence provided by the institution under review, as well as on information received from civil society organizations and other stakeholders;

(b) The review has also become fairer, since an appeals procedure has been included to give institutions an opportunity to challenge the recommendations issued by the Subcommittee on Accreditation;

(c) The Subcommittee on Accreditation has developed general observations, interpreting the Paris Principles, which have been adopted by the Bureau;

(d) The Subcommittee on Accreditation now also welcomes reports from civil society organizations on the functioning and efficiency of national human rights institutions under review. Such reports are shared with the institutions concerned for their comments or clarifications;

(e) Summaries of all documentation received from institutions are prepared by the secretariat and are shared with the relevant institutions prior to review. National human rights institutions are given one week to point out any factual errors in the summaries. The summaries and comments are subsequently brought to the attention of the Subcommittee's members;

(f) During the session, the Subcommittee on Accreditation conducts telephone interviews with the national human rights institutions under review;

(g) The Subcommittee on Accreditation systematically issues tailored recommendations to the national human rights institution under review, even when it recommends "A" status;

(h) Recommendations by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, once adopted by the Bureau, are made public in the report of the Subcommittee, which is posted on the Global Alliance's website.[1]

11. In accordance with article 16.2 of the Statute, where it appears that the circumstances of any national human rights institution accredited with an "A" status may have changed in a way which affects its compliance with the Paris Principles, the Chair of the Global Alliance, or the Subcommittee on Accreditation, may initiate a special review of the accreditation of that institution. Further to the special review, the status of the institution can be either maintained or downgraded.

12. It is stipulated in article 18.2 of the Statute that where, in the opinion of the Chair of the Global Alliance, an exceptional circumstance exists necessitating urgent consideration of the immediate suspension of an accredited "A" status institution, the Bureau may decide to immediately suspend the accreditation classification of that institution and initiate a special review, pursuant to article 16.2 of the Statute. Article 18.3 describes the procedure to be followed for the immediate suspension of accreditation in exceptional circumstances. As stipulated in article 18.4: "for the purposes of article 18.2 and 18.3, an 'exceptional circumstance' refers to a sudden and drastic change in the internal political order of a State", such as a break in the constitutional or democratic order, or a declared state of emergency, or gross violations of human rights; which is accompanied by any of the following: (a) a change in the national human rights institution – enabling legislation or other applicable law that is contrary to the Paris Principles; (b) a change in the composition of the national human rights institution that is not undertaken in accordance with the established selection and/or appointment process; or (c) the national human rights institution acts in a way that seriously compromises its compliance with the Paris Principles.

13. In conformity with the accreditation procedure set out in article 12 of the Statute, the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are submitted to the Bureau for it to make the final decision on the accreditation status of the institutions reviewed, in accordance with the following process:

(a) The recommendation made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation is forwarded to the applicant;

(b) Within 28 days of receipt of the recommendation, the applicant may challenge it by submitting, through OHCHR, a written communication to the Chair of the Global Alliance;

(c) The report of the Subcommittee, including the recommendation, is forwarded to the Bureau. Any challenges from the institution reviewed, together with the statements of compliance and the summaries prepared by OHCHR of all the documents submitted by the institution concerned, are sent to the Bureau members to enable them to assess the validity of the challenges;

(d) If, within 20 days of receipt of the report and the challenges, at least four members of the Bureau, from no fewer than two regional groups, notify the secretariat that they support the objection to the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, the recommendation is referred to the Bureau at its next meeting for a decision;

[1] See nhri.ohchr.org.

(e) If at least four members, from two or more regional groups, do not raise any objection to the recommendation within 20 days of its receipt, it will be deemed approved by the Bureau;

(f) The accreditation decision of the Bureau is final.

14. Until the accreditation process described above is completed and decisions are final, the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation remain confidential, and are shared only with the national human rights institution concerned.

15. In addition to members of the Subcommittee on Accreditation and representatives of OHCHR, the following may attend meetings of the Subcommittee as observers: representatives from the secretariats of the Network of African National Human Rights Institutions, the Asia-Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions, the European Network of National Human Rights Institutions and the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas, and the representative of the Global Alliance. All those attending the meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are bound by a confidentiality clause, until the accreditation decisions are final and the Subcommittee reports are made public and posted on the website of the Global Alliance.

16. The Subcommittee on Accreditation has acknowledged the dedication and professionalism demonstrated by OHCHR in assuming the secretariat function and successfully servicing two sessions per year.

III. Accreditation during the period under review

A. Second session in 2014

17. The second session in 2014 of the Subcommittee on Accreditation was held from 27 to 31 October. During that session, the Subcommittee received, under article 10 of the Statute, applications for accreditation from the Finnish National Human Rights Institution, the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, of Hungary, and the National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights, of Libya, which was established in 2011 by the National Transitional Council of Libya. In accordance with article 15 of the Statute, the Subcommittee on Accreditation also reviewed the continued full compliance with the Paris Principles of the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission, the People's Advocate, of Albania, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights, the Malawi Human Rights Commission, the National Human Rights Commission, of Mauritius, the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia, the *Defensoría del Pueblo* of Paraguay, the National Human Rights Commission of Korea, the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation, the National Human Rights Commission, of Thailand, and the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights. Under article 16.2 of the Statute, the National Human Rights Commission, of Nepal, and the *Defensoría del Pueblo*, of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, were reviewed. The outcome of the session is reflected in the annexed chart.

B. First session in 2015

18. The first session in 2015 was held from 16 to 20 March. During that session, the High Commission for Human Rights, of Iraq, the Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia, and the National Human Rights Institution and Ombudsman of Uruguay were reviewed for accreditation, in accordance with article 10 of the Statute. The "A" status institutions of

Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Malawi, the Republic of Korea, and Serbia, and of Scotland, were reaccredited or had their reaccreditation deferred, under article 15 of the Statute. The national human rights institution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was reviewed under article 16.2. The annex shows the outcome of the session.

C. Second session in 2015

19. From 16 to 20 November 2015, the Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed the national human rights institutions of Cyprus, Ireland and Myanmar for accreditation, in accordance with article 10 of the Statute. In accordance with article 15 of the Statute, a review was carried out of "A" status institutions, namely those of Germany, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, the State of Palestine, and Qatar, and of Great Britain. The national human rights institution of Thailand was reviewed under article 18.1 of the Statute. The outcome of the session is reflected in the annex.

D. First session in 2016

20. At the first session in 2016, held from 9 to 13 May, under article 10 of the Statute, the Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed the national human rights institutions of Bahrain, Côte d'Ivoire, Montenegro, Samoa, Uruguay and Zimbabwe for accreditation. Under article 15 of the Statute, the institutions of Cameroon, Canada, Greece, Honduras, Malawi, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, and Sierra Leone, and of Northern Ireland, were reviewed for reaccreditation. The institutions of Burundi and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela were reviewed under article 16.2 of the Statute. The outcome of the session will be published upon completion of the procedure set out in article 12 of the Statute.

21. During the four sessions under review, the Subcommittee on Accreditation issued recommendations emphasizing the need for a clear, transparent and participatory process for selecting the members of national human rights institutions, as required by the Paris Principles and by the Subcommittee in its general observations. The Subcommittee stressed the importance of the provision of adequate core funding by States to ensure the independence and financial autonomy of national human rights institutions. The Subcommittee also recognized the importance of members of institutions being granted immunity against legal liability for actions taken in their official capacity. Furthermore, it stressed the need for greater cooperation between national human rights institutions and the regional and international human rights systems.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

22. **The interdependence and indivisibility of human rights require that the broad mandate of national human rights institutions, as set out in the Paris Principles and emphasized by the Subcommittee, include the promotion and protection of all rights — civil, political, economic, social and cultural — for everyone.**

23. **The Paris Principles require that the composition of national human rights institutions and the appointment of their members, by means of election or otherwise, ensure the pluralistic representation of social forces (civil society) involved in the protection and promotion of human rights. The Subcommittee on Accreditation interprets that provision as requiring a clear, transparent, merit-based and participatory selection and appointment process. The Subcommittee recommends that the selection and appointment process be formalized in legislation establishing**

national human rights institutions and/or in binding administrative guidelines, as appropriate.

24. Newly established national human rights institutions are encouraged to request accreditation by the Global Alliance in order for them to be able to interact effectively with peer institutions as well as with the regional and international human rights systems.

25. National human rights institutions are urged to implement recommendations emanating from the Subcommittee on Accreditation with a view to enhancing their compliance with the Paris Principles and their effectiveness in discharging their mandate. Governments, and other stakeholders, including United Nations entities, are encouraged to assist national human rights institutions in implementing those recommendations.

26. The Secretary-General commends the Subcommittee on Accreditation for its performance and underscores the dedicated and professional support provided by OHCHR to its work, including in the accreditation process.

27. The Paris Principles, and the general observations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation interpreting those principles, remain the basis upon which the Subcommittee accredits national human rights institutions. In order to support this process, the Subcommittee invites civil society organizations to provide input on the functioning of institutions under review, in addition to the legislation and other documentation submitted by institutions.

29. The Secretary-General encourages Member States and other stakeholders to enable OHCHR, through financial contributions, to maintain high-quality servicing of the Subcommittee on Accreditation.

30. With the enhanced role of "A" status national human rights institutions in the proceedings of the Human Rights Council and the prospect of achieving the same in other United Nations mechanisms and processes, the Subcommittee is encouraged to be more vigilant and rigorous in granting "A" status, in order to ensure that only institutions fully compliant with the Paris Principles can make use of the benefits granted to "A" status institutions.

31. The role of OHCHR as secretariat for the Subcommittee, and in holding the Subcommittee's meetings under its auspices, enhances the credibility of the accreditation process before the international and regional human rights systems. The presence of OHCHR during the decision-making process is instrumental to attesting to the compliance of this process with the established rules of procedure, and contributes to its transparency, fairness and rigour.

32. The Statute of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, and the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, are silent on cases where, in deliberations, there may be a split vote. In order to avoid a deadlock in such situations, the Secretary-General recommends to the Global Alliance, with the support of the secretariat (OHCHR), to make proposals for a solution that ensures full respect for the Paris Principles and a most effective accreditation process.

Annex

Status of national institutions accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions

Accreditation status as at 26 January 2016

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the Statute of the Global Alliance, the Global Alliance uses the following classifications for accreditation:

A: Compliant with the Paris Principles

B: Not fully compliant with the Paris Principles

C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

*A(R): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for the conferral of "A" status, is no longer awarded. It is now only used when referring to institutions that were accredited with this status before April 2008.

Human Rights Council

"A" status institutions (72)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 – A* November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
India: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 – A*
Indonesia: National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM)	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012* November 2013 – special review in March 2014 March 2014 – A*
Jordan: National Centre for Human Rights	A	April 2006 – (B) March 2007 – (B) October 2007 – A* October 2010 – A November 2015 – deferred to second session of 2016

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Malaysia: Human Rights Commission (SUHAKAM)	A	2002 April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B November 2009 – A* October 2010 – A November 2015 – A
Mongolia: National Human Rights Commission	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A
Nepal: National Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A October 2007 – A* November 2008 – A* March 2010 – recommended to be accredited B May 2011 – A November 2012 – October 2014 special review – A maintained
New Zealand: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Philippines: Philippines Commission on Human Rights	A	1999 March 2007 – deferred to October 2007 October 2007 March 2012
Qatar: National Committee for Human Rights	A	October 2006 – (B) March 2009 – A* March 2010 – A* October 2010 – A November 2015 – A
Republic of Korea: National Human Rights Commission	A	2004 November 2008 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – deferred to first session of 2016
State of Palestine: Independent Commission for Human Rights	A	2005 – A(R) March 2009 – A November 2015 – A
Timor-Leste: *Provedoria* for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008 November 2013
Africa		
Burundi: *Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme*	A	November 2012
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999 October 2006 – (B) March 2010 – A March 2015 – deferred to first session of 2016

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	April 2006 – (B) October 2006 – A October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred November 2015 – deferred to second session of 2016
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001 November 2008 March 2014
Kenya: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005 November 2008 October 2014 – A
Malawi: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – deferred to first session of 2016
Mauritania: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	A	November 2009 – (B) May 2011 – A
Mauritius: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	A	2002 April 2008 – A* October 2014 – A
Morocco: *Conseil national des droits de l'homme*	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – A* November 2015 – A
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 – A(R) April 2006 May 2011
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 – A October 2006 – A October 2007 – B May 2011 – A
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles May 2013 – A
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
South Africa: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012
Togo: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – A
Uganda: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008 May 2013 – A
United Republic of Tanzania: Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 – A October 2011 – A*
Zambia: Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011
Americas		
Argentina: *Defensoría del Pueblo*	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): *Defensor del Pueblo*	A	1999 – (B) 2000 – A March 2007 March 2012
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Chile: *Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos*	A	November 2012
Colombia: *Defensoría del Pueblo*	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – A*
Costa Rica: *Defensoría de los Habitantes*	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Ecuador: *Defensor del Pueblo*	A	1999 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 – A; recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles March 2009 – A March 2015 – A
El Salvador: *Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*	A	April 2006 May 2011

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Guatemala: *Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos*	A	1999 – (B) 2000 – A(R) 2002 April 2008 May 2013 – A
Haiti: Office for the Protection of Citizens	A	November 2013
Mexico: *Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos*	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Nicaragua: *Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*	A	April 2006 May 2011
Panama: *Defensoría del Pueblo*	A	1999 October 2006 November 2012
Peru: *Defensoría del Pueblo*	A	1999 March 2007 March 2012
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): *Defensoría del Pueblo*	A	2002 April 2008 May 2013 March 2014 – special review in October 2014 October 2014 – special review deferred to March 2015 March 2015 – recommended to be accredited B, given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles
Europe		
Albania: People's Advocate	A	2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A
Armenia: Human Rights Defender	A	April 2006 – A(R) October 2006 – A October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – A
Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)	A	October 2006 October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – recommended to be accredited B, given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles March 2012 – A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Bosnia and Herzegovina: Institution of Human Rights Ombudsmen	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles October 2010 – A
Croatia: Ombudsman	A	April 2008 May 2013
Denmark: Danish Institute for Human Rights	A	1999 – (B) 2001 October 2007 – A November 2012
Finland: Finnish National Human Rights Institution	A	October 2014 – A
France: *Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – A
Georgia: Public Defender's Office	A	October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – A
Germany: German Institute for Human Rights	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 March 2015 – deferred to November 2015 November 2015 – A
Great Britain (United Kingdom): Equality and Human Rights Commission	A	November 2008 – A October 2010, special review – A November 2015 – A
Greece: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* November 2009 – A* March 2010 – A* March 2015 – deferred to first session of 2016
Hungary: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights	A	November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A
Ireland: Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission	A	November 2015 – A
Latvia: Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia	A	March 2015 – A

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Luxembourg: *Commission consultative des droits de l'homme*	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 March 2009 – A* November 2009 – A* October 2010 – A November 2015 – A
Netherlands: Netherlands Institute for Human Rights	A	March 2014
Northern Ireland (United Kingdom): Human Rights Commission	A	2001 – (B) May 2011
Poland: Human Rights Defender	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012
Portugal: *Provedor de Justiça*	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 – (B) 2001 – (B) November 2008 – A November 2013 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A
Scotland (United Kingdom): Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 2009 – deferred to March 2010 March 2010 – A March 2015 – A
Serbia: Protector of Citizens	A	March 2010 – A March 2015 – A
Spain: *El Defensor del Pueblo*	A	2000 October 2007 November 2012
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	April 2008 – (B) March 2009 – A March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – A

"B" status institutions (29)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Americas		
Honduras: *Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos*	B	2000 October 2007 – (A) October 2010 – special review; recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles October 2011 – B
Asia and the Pacific		
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission	B	May 2011 March 2015 – B

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Iraq: High Commission for Human Rights	B	March 2015 – B
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008 March 2010
Myanmar: Myanmar National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2015 – B
Oman: National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Sri Lanka: Human Rights Commission	B	2000 October 2007 March 2009
Thailand: National Human Rights Commission	B	2004 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles November 2015 – B
Central Asia		
Kazakhstan: The Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgyzstan: The Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: The Human Rights Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Africa		
Algeria: *Commission nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de l'homme*	B	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A March 2009 – B March 2010 – deferred to October 2010 October 2010 – B
Chad: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – B
Congo: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	B	October 2010
Ethiopia: Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Libya: National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights	B	October 2014 – B

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Mali: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	B	March 2012
Senegal: *Comité sénégalais des droits de l'homme*	B	2000 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles November 2012 – B
Tunisia: *Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales*	B	November 2009
Europe		
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection Against Discrimination	B	October 2011
Bulgaria: The Ombudsman	B	October 2011
Cyprus: Commissioner for Administration and Human Rights	B	November 2015 – B
Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	B	2003 – A(R) 2004 – A(R) 2005 – A(R) April 2006 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with the Paris Principles November 2012 – B
Republic of Moldova: Human Rights Centre	B	November 2009
Slovakia: Slovak National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 March 2012 – Accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation March 2014 – B
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman	B	May 2011
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: The Ombudsman	B	October 2011

"C" status institutions (10)

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Benin: *Commission béninoise des droits de l'homme*	C	2002
Madagascar: *Commission nationale des droits de l'homme*	C	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) April 2006 – status withdrawn October 2006 – C
Americas		
Antigua and Barbuda: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Barbados: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Puerto Rico (United States of America): *Oficina del Procurador del Ciudadano del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico*	C	March 2007
Asia and the Pacific		
Hong Kong, China: Equal Opportunities Commission	C	2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of): Islamic Human Rights Commission	C	2000
Europe		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011
Switzerland: Federal Commission for Women's Issues	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism	C	1998 – (B) March 2010 – C

Suspended institutions

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspended Note: The Commission resigned from the then International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 2 April 2007	2000 (A) March 2007 – accreditation suspended; documents to be submitted at October 2007 session 2 April 2007 – The Commission resigned from the then International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights
Africa		
Niger: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales	Removed Note: Dissolved in February 2010	March 2010 – removed further to its dissolution in February 2010
Americas		
Paraguay: *Defensoría del Pueblo*	Suspended Note: The *Defensoría* resigned from the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on 10 July 2014	2003 November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to March 2014 March 2014 – deferred to October 2014 October 2014 – suspended

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Burkina Faso: *Commission nationale des droits humains*		2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 – B March 2012 – accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation

Dissolved institutions

Institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Europe		
Belgium: The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism		December 2014 – The institution has been transformed into two separate institutions: The Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Discrimination and Racism; and The Federal Centre for the Analysis of Migration Flows